

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated March 6, 2007, Applicants have amended claims 27 – 29 and 31 to more particularly recite and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 13 and 30 have been canceled. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Examiner's Comments on the Specification

Applicants have reviewed the abstract of the disclosure and submit that it is in proper form. If the Examiner has a particular objection to the specification, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner indicate the particular objection in the next Office Action so that Applicants can adequately respond.

III. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, indicating that the features of “a primary molding step ... component exposed,” “forming ... a desired circuit,” and a structural element that encloses the die to fill the die with resin, as recited in claim 27, are not shown in any of the Figures. The Examiner’s attention is directed to Figure 9, particularly steps 9b and 9c, which illustrate a primary molding step, and step 9d, which illustrates a forming step. Figure 1 depicts a module component. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 27 – 29 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

First, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how a molding die is capable of filling with resin when there is no secondary molding die to prevent the resin from escaping the molding device. The Examiner's attention is directed to Figure 9 and the associated portions of the specification which clearly describe this feature.

Second, the Examiner questions whether the "molded element molded with resin" is formed during the first molded step or the second molded step, or at some other time. Again, the Examiner is directed to Figure 9 and the associated portions of the specification which clearly describes that creating the molding element includes both the first and second molding steps.

Third, the Examiner questions whether the "desired circuit" refers to the circuit wiring or an end electrode of the chip component. Applicants have deleted this recitation.

Finally, the Examiner questions whether the recitations of "an end electrode of the chip component" recited in claim 27 refer to the same end electrode. Applicants have amended claim 27 to recite a first end electrode and a second end electrode so as to clarify that two end electrodes are being referenced.

As Applicants have addressed every issue raised by the Examiner, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully solicited.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,768,286 to Ketcham in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,497,033 to Fillion. Claim 29 has been rejected under § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Ketcham and Fillion, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,983 to Curtin. Claim 31 has been rejected under § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kethcam and Fillion, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,228,676 to Glenn. Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 27, the Examiner asserts that Ketcham discloses every claim feature except the use of resin and the step of forming a circuit wiring, and relies on Fillion to overcome this deficiency. However, neither Ketcham nor Fillion, alone or in combination with each other, disclose at least the primary and secondary molding steps recited in claim 27, wherein a molding die is filled with resin by alternately exposing a first end electrode and a second end electrode.

Ketcham appears to disclose a procedure for packaging a printed circuit board wherein the circuit board and its components are covered with a thin mold release layer before placing the circuit board into its packaging. The packaging includes a foam material, and when the printed circuit board is placed into the packaging, a molding fitting for the circuit board is created. The printed circuit board can then be removed from the packaging, the mold release layer can be removed from the printed circuit board, and the printed circuit board can be placed back into the packaging. Ketcham does not disclose or suggest the primary and secondary molding steps as recited in claim 27.

Fillion does not overcome this deficiency and the Examiner has not relied on Fillion for this teaching. Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP § 2143.03), and none of the cited references, alone or in combination with each other, disclose or even suggest at least the features recited above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 27 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 28, 29, and 31 depend from claim 27. Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Harness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir.

1987). Accordingly, as claim 27 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

VI. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:DAB
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 6, 2007